DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 407 EC 110 356

AUTHOR Brown, Geraldine E.
TITLE Winning Through Determination or a Business Approach to Interagency Involvement. Prevocational Training for Autistic Youth: Methods, Materials, and Interagency Involvement.
PUB DATE May 78
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual International Convention, The Council for Exceptional Children (56th, Kansas City, Missouri, May 2-5, 1978, Session W4)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adolescents; *Autism; *Business Communication; *Interagency Cooperation; Prevocational Education; *Program Planning

ABSTRACT

The paper proposes some guidelines for providing prevocational training for autistic youth through cooperation with agencies and businesses. Characteristics to look for in selecting someone for negotiating with agencies are described, and factors to watch for while negotiating with agencies are discussed. (SBH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

W4

ED153407

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WINNING THROUGH DETERMINATION OR

A BUSINESS APPROACH TO INTERAGENCY INVOLVEMENT

Prevocational Training for Autistic Youth:

Methods, Materials, and interagency Involvement

CEC Convention - 1978

Wednesday, May 3, 1:15 - 3:00

Geraldine E. Brown

Gateway School
4000 Silver Star Road
Orlando, Florida 32808

EC110356

WINNING THROUGH DETERMINATION or

A Business Approach to Interagency Involvement

You, or your boss, have decided that it is time to work on some vocational alternatives for your severely handicapped youth. You know that they have the potential to maintain a job, but how do you get them into the job market. In order to provide alternatives for the youth being served in your school you, or your boss, are going to have to work with some private agencies and perhaps some of the representatives of the large state agencies in providing services for these youth. Working with such agencies and businesses can prove to be an extremely frustrating experience, if you are not prepared mentally, physically and emotionally for such interactions. If you have not had the previous pleasure of negotiating with the bargaining agents for these agencies, it is time for you to get organized. If you wish to accomplish anything visible in the hours you will expend with various personnel, it is time to get organized.

Packard(1962) relates that many of the skills required in the business world are also transferable to the world of education, politics and the military. There are people and computer machines in all four worlds that need to be handled and instructed in how to run things. However, one essential difference between business and educational institutions, which are not profit making, is that educational institutions cannot issue orders in the flat fashion that

business managers can. They must depend more upon voluntary hold and the marshaling of public support for their endeavors. It is also relevant to add that decision making within the education system is highly structured by rulebook procedures, outside regulations, and as a result there is a great deal of emphasis upon attention to detail. School board attorneys certainly earn their fees, as they review agreements between agencies, whose purpose is to provide some service to the youth within the system.

In order to provide new services for the students, organizing for results, is a must. This implies that you already know where you want to go and what you want to do there. It also implies that your boss, or other members of the management team see that this endeavor is a worthwhile goal. Have you used the problem solving approach in defining your goal? Have you answered these questions?

1. Where are we now? (definition of problem)
2. What do we want to do? (establishing objectives)
3. Have we considered Men, Money, Materials, Time and Space? (getting the facts)
4. Have we looked at the whole picture? (weighing and deciding)
5. Are we willing to take action? (otherwise all else is futile)
6. Are we willing to evaluate the results? (checking effectiveness, improvements)

Armstrong(1974) suggests that if you have used this approach and have some concrete ideas, put them in writing. You should clearly spell out what you believe should be done, in writing, and put it away for a couple of months. Then look at it again to see how it feels, if it is still right, then get it typed up and begin to work on it. Townsend(1970) goes so far as to suggest that if you want to get something done involving several departments, or even organizations, keep

quiet about it. He suggests using the problem solving approach, marshalling your allies, thinking through the opponents defenses and then beginning. Did you startle at the word opponents? If so, you have never spent fifteen (15) hours discussing a plan, which was discarded due to lack of approval by the Board of Directors of the agency. Townsend(1970) further suggests that a premature announcement of what you are going to do unsettles potential supporters, gives opponents time to construct real and imaginary defenses, and tends to ensure failure. If you don't agree with him, go ahead and write up an agreement, and then sit down to discuss it with your "cooperative" agency. The term "opponents" will then appear to be a very appropriate term for referring to the agency personnel.

This entire paper is based upon the premise that there is no one best way to handle any of the various management functions involved in interagency agreements. As Carlisle(1973) relates: "There is no one way to plan;there is no one best way to lead; there is no one best way to organize a group; and there is no one best way to control the activities of an organization." The best concepts and techniques can be selected only after one is aware of the particular circumstances he is facing. There are indeed basic guidelines for planning, basic knowledge of communication skills, and basic theories of organizations, which are appropriate to all situations and need to be kept in mind during all negotiations. According to Carlisle(1973) if we were to identify the top twelve organizational experts in the United States and secure their opinions on how to solve a particular organizational problem; the likely result would be twelve different

answers. Furthermore to get them to concur on the one best way would probably be impossible.

Batten(1963) outlines the detailed definitive blueprint for planning which is outlined by the Department of the Air Force. This blueprint consists of twenty-four (24) elaborately defined steps. These twenty-four (24) steps can be condensed into five major steps: 1) Definition: 2) Development of plan: 3) Agency cooperation: 4) Conducting operation, and 5) Evaluation. Here is a simplified version of a blueprint for planning:

1. Definition - Outline and evaluate a series of specific objectives by using a succession of steps to establish a sequence of accomplishments, including the what, where, when, who, how and why of the project.

2. Development of plan - Develop a detailed pattern which includes organizational structure, provisions for materials, facilities, funds, personnel and time, and a means of insuring compliance with prescribed procedures.

3. Agency cooperation - Arrange cooperation of elements through use of proper channels in establishing conferences and discussions, formal and informal exchanges of information, proper liaison, and understandings of common objectives.

4. Conducting operation - Insure that actual work gets underway and is performed in accordance with the plan and schedule, that all procedures are understood by all personnel, and that requirements are met, or that changes in operation are made smoothly.

5. Evaluation - Utilize planned corrective actions by removing bottlenecks, seeking possible improvements, measuring progress of operation, and determining extent to which operations are contributing to overall effectiveness of the organization.

Before you begin planning, a most important action must be taken. The people who will establish and build this new venture must be selected. As Batten(1963) states, "The right people are very often

the key factor in making a new venture or new program work." They must be creative, imaginative and energetic. Batten(1963) further relates that top management people must really know their middle management people on an intimate basis, so that they will have little difficulty in selecting the right ones (or one).

Factors to look for in selecting the WHO

The effective WHO does not allow the organization to run him; he controls the use of his time carefully. He refuses to waste time on nonessential functions and he plots his days and weeks and years to permit him to concentrate on the major jobs that have to be done. He doesn't allow his time to become fractionated to the point where he does a lot of everything, but gets little or nothing done. In relation to major jobs, Packard (1962) goes even further by proposing that WHO's enjoy, that's right, enjoy, organizing and running large projects. Packard(1962) states that this self-starter is thrilled to accept a job with a minimum of briefing. So it is wise to have basic ideas in mind, but not to complete any of the five levels of planning before selection of the WHO.

Kelly(1965) elaborates on the quality of leadership which is needed in any business relationship. The leader must know where he is going and has the art of getting others to want to do something he is convinced should be done. He must be contagiously enthusiastic about the project himself, and in addition, he never asks anybody to do anything he could not do himself and do well. These are the kind of WHO's that all men will follow.

Passivity is not a characteristic of a WHO. Cox(1974) warns of the types of comments made by those with an attitude of passivity: "What should I do now?" "The circumstances were beyond my control." "Oh, I never expected that." "But you didn't tell me I was supposed to do that." "Fat chance that could ever happen." "I wish I had been aware of that." "Everything is going against me." "I told you so." Passivity is an attempt to make others come to you, and is designed to put others into your service. It is avoiding taking a chance, is a guarantee of not making a mistake and above all it is avoiding responsibility. The effective WHO responds to provocation objectively and effectively; has a high tolerance for frustration, accepts signs of fight, has the capacity to bounce back, the ability to have his ideas pulled apart, and is only minimally influence by his personal likes or dislikes.

Armstrong(1974) suggests that the successful WHO knows his own strengths and weaknesses; from his experiences, from people have told him and from objective evaluations. He is well aware of what he can't do at all and what he can't do very well. He feels that he is responsible for results and he really does hold himself accountable. He may be tough, and he may be hard driving, and he may be demanding; but almost always he is honest and fair with his people. He is also a good communicator, because he knows that when people are well informed that they know not only how to do what they are doing, but why they are doing it; and this is a significant source of motivation.

As Townsend(1970) states "Things get done in our society because of a man or a woman with conviction." Often times the light of conviction is in the eyes of the junior men: therefore all decisions should be made as low as possible in the organization. In relation to this idea, it is important that in following the channels of contacts, the person responsible for the day to day negotiations should keep the superior informed of any matter for which the superior is held responsible. In relation to this, it is important to differentiate between risk-taking decisions and problem solving decisions. Many management personnel at lower level do have to solve problems. As Packard(1962) states "There is little risk in solving a problem wrong. On the other hand when you must act on the basis of a few know facts--as when you must decide whether to defy the union--you are making a risk-taking decision."

There are certain personality characteristics of the WHO which need to be identified. It is necessary to keep in mind that the WHO is selling a product, usually student performance or student services, to another agency. If you are cooperating with a mental health agency in establishing a group home school for truant youth, you will sell that agency on the fact that these students can be helped and that they will assist in keeping the group home in good condition. If you are cooperating in integrating autistic youth into a sheltered workshop, you are selling the agency on the fact that these young adults do have a high production rate and will work within the setting with a minimum of disruption to other clients. Packard(1962) feels that persuasion and verbal expression are prerequisite skills, in addition to optimism. He further relates that the most successful

sales managers tend to verge on the manic side of the picture. Most intriguing, were his results that indicated that the most successful tended to be more inaccurate. more masculine and more doninant than the other managers.

Bittel(1964) reveals the number one secret of success--the ability to maintain a high level of thrust. He relates that these men are not table-pounders; often they are able to maintain a calm, controlled manner. They may have terrific nervous and mental energy, and the drive may be psychic in origin, not physical. In addition, the successful WHO is described by Packard(1962) as continually questioning himself. He seems willing to examine himself carefully and ask himself embarrassing questions. At the same time he has a high degree of self respect. The successful WHO also understands the rules of competitive warfare (It's not a dog eat dog world, but I do get nibbled at). He also expresses hostility tactfully (He tells the other man to drop dead without batting an eyelash). Ringer (1973) expounds a Thirty Year Theory, which explains drive in terms of going after all you can get, as quickly as you can get it, because your time for doing is so limited here on earth. Ringer(1973) also reveals that the super salesman does not take himself too seriously, and proposes a "Theory of Sustenance of a Positive Attitude Through the Assumption of a Negative Result." This theory helps explain the positive mental attitude and drive found in many successful salesmen. Ringer's theory states that everyone engaged in a business deal should realistically assume that it will not work out. He should not assume that he cannot make the agreement work, but

that it probably will not work out. Armed with this preparedness and confidence, the WHO can go into each negotiation hoping for the best, but realistically assuming the worst. The reasoning for this type of attitude lies in the fact that there are an endless number of factors that are beyond the WHO's control, which very from third party opinions, ulterior motives, business agency guidelines, to motivation of the agency personnel involved.

Batten(1963) tells the story of a youthful manager who attributed all of his success to his real thirst for seeing the total picture--he always wanted to know why a thing was done. He relates that vision may be partly an inborn trait, but it may be improved greatly by developing a curiosity about business in general, your organization and the world around you. Perhaps with a little more vision, some of the negative results which are assumed by Ringer can be alleviated.

In summary, the WHO must possess discipline, self control, business statemanship, and dignity. Dignity includes: individuality; an unwillingness to compromise with half-truths and foggy interpretations of morality; a genuine concern for the growth, development and happiness of others; humbleness in connection with the almighty, but no such humbleness toward your fellow man; and lastly, a real desire to accomplish something.

Once this WHO has been located, the authority to negotiate must be delegated. This delegation of authority is the first step in the next phase of the business approach to interagency involvement.

Factors to watch for while accomplishing the HOW

The man in the organization has the characteristics of the WHO, and has the most to gain from a successful negotiation with the agency. Now it is time to take the pains to write out on a sheet of paper the optimum and minimum expected from each area of the agreement. If a copy of a contract with another agency is available as an example, that would also be useful. If the organization you work in has procedures which must be followed by law, in regards to treatment of clients, then copies of similar procedures should be furnished to WHO. Give WHO a couple of days to review and discuss the outline you gave him of the agreement. When you have both agreed on what you wish to accomplish through negotiations, the head of the agency with whom you are contracting should be called or asked to come to a meeting. During the phone call or the meeting, the agency personnel should be told that Mr. WHO is responsible for negotiations, that whatever he recommends will be done, and that there is no appeal over his head. If other agencies are involved, their respective heads should be contacted also, so that they are aware of the official delegation of authority to Mr. WHO.

Disregarding the discouragement of others who have already engaged in negotiations with that agency is discussed by Ringer(1973) and Kelly(1965). Ringer classes such personnel in the 'Discouragement Fraternity' and decided that all members were full of baloney. Kelly ask that when working in any business, that one not listen too intently or take too seriously the history and traditions involving

people and their so-called political situations. It is important to keep in mind that man is moved most strongly by his own economic good; if he is in business, he is in business to make money. While the gossipers are busy beating their gums about political trivialities, it is best to short-circuit this information in your own mind and to spend your time selling your product. Kelly relates that sometimes it is actually a disadvantage to know too much about the past history of a business.

Some of the things that you do need to know about a company are outlined by Batten(1963). It is essential to know what the major function of the company is, where the company has been and where it is going, what types of products it markets, when goals must be met, who works for whom, who does what for whom, who is the contact person, who should be informed of negotiations, why the company is in business, and what they feel is the most efficient structuring process for personnel. Bittel(1964) states that it is essential to be aware of the size of the organization as well. He states that when an organization is small, verbal communication is adequate in keeping people informed on what is taking place. However, as the organization becomes larger, more written reports and communications are necessary to maintain the same level of communication. Size also affect the details and complexity of the planning systems. Simple operations require relatively simple systems. However, the more numerous and complex the operations, the more complex the planning and control systems. Size affects the other dimensions of structure, for as the organization grows in size, there is more need for formal

procedures to coordinate or integrate activities. Special structures, such as committees may be needed to integrate the diverse interests represented in the organization.

Carlisle(1973) discussed the need for knowledge concerning the organizational structure. The organizational structure is a system of relationships, formally prescribed and informally developed that govern the activities of people who are dependent upon each other for the accomplishment of common goals or the satisfaction of common needs. In a formal structure, positions are prescribed to designate associated tasks and responsibilities. Relationships among the positions are also defined. The informal structure reflects the actual functioning of the organization when people have assumed the positions and modified, confirmed and/or expanded the formal relationships through the process of social interaction. Formal organization is how those in authority want an organization to function; informal organization is how it actually functions. Without being aware of the informal organizational structure, many hours could be expended in discussing issues with the wrong personnel in the agency(wrong in terms of power or position). The final factor to be considered in knowing the organization is the nature of leadership. Carlisle (1973) states that if leaders have confidence in and trust their subordinates, they are not as apt to tie them down with rules and regulations. Leaders who distrust their subordinates are apt to have a passion for extensive rules and regulations.

In learning about the structure of the organization, several motivational factors need to be kept in mind. Batten(1963) points

out that intellingent self interest is a prerequisite to motivation, productivity, and generally good performance. To state the facts simply, a person will seldom put his best effort into a thing unless he sees the benefit to himself, even though he may be generally altruistic. A person cannot give himself totally to others, although most of his satisfaction may come from seeing the achievements of others. He vitally needs a strong feeling of self-achievement. Secondly, when a person is asked to make a contribution to a group effort that purports to be and is continuously represented to be, the idea and passion of somebody else, it is basic to human nature that he will not give it his all. Lastly the strong emergence of individuality will accordingly be hampered by the leader who talks about himself directly or indirectly by making frequent use of I, My and Mine. Knowledge of the third set of circumstances in an organization can be extremely helpful to Mr. WHO during negotiations.

While learning the organization through meetings and telephone conversations, several personality types will come into focus. Batten (1963) states that in just about every staff or production meeting or board room, one can find the innovator and the "abominable no man" and types who are somewhere in between. He delineates several of these: 1) the bright eyed zealot who feels that anything connected with growth and newness must be good, regardless of cost or profit; 2) the man who waits for the boss to tip his hand so that he can agree (gutless); 3) the suave individual who makes progressive-sounding comments, uses the word dynamic often and contrives largely to hold his job; 4) the tough minded man who demands facts, a blueprint

for action and realistic controls, yet is impatient to get something done; 5) the man who is opposed to innovation of any kind if it involves courage and positive action (His usual reaction to new ideas, is "Come on now, let's be realistic.").

In addition to the members of the staff, Packard(1962) delineates the different forms of executives to be found in organizations, according to states of mind. State of Mind I Man is a believer in authoritarianism, with himself as the authority to be obeyed. One should not be misled by the door is always open gesture, as he is predisposed to dominate. His natural feelings of ascendancy make it easy for him to ask people to do what he wants. In fact, it never occurs to him that his orders, and orders disguised as suggestions will not be followed. State of Mind II Man is likely to be more than a little self-righteous. He believes that any project he undertakes is an exalted one. He hesitates to bend from his stance of certitude even on small particulars because it might endanger his concept of himself as the all knowing father. He is also surrounded all day by people who share his view of the world, or by definition owe him deference, or would hurt their own budding careers by opposing or arguing with the man at the top. State of Mind III Man is likely to be dangerously low in sense of humor. State of Mind IV Man is at least mildly anti-intellectual and anti-creative, although of course, he considers himself creative. He states that people in 'intellectual' pursuits tend to be antibusiness. Each group seems wary of the aims and ideals of the other. State of Mind V is likely to be in favor of innovating and risk-taking for himself but takes

an exceedingly dim view of innovating and risk-taking by others, in or out of business. Many of these leaders are natural gamblers in the sense that they are in their power race for the game, not the money, which they have already made. They will play hard to win, sometimes ferociously hard. They would agree with the statement that creating change is the key to leadership. State of Mind VI Man is obsessed with growth. State of Mind VII Man is quite likely to have developed a passionate fondness for orderliness. His long years of climbing the pyramid have led him to derive great satisfaction from the well ordered life his position commands. He details out the status and procedure for almost every conceivable kind of human response. His orderliness has its counterpart in the officers way of life in the military organization.

In relation to these differing types of men, Packard(1962) also states that each man has a strategy for moving ahead. Each man finds out that just one man can force all the others to play the political game for self-protection. The one who has the indispensable quality of maze-brightness is usually the one who is not afraid to admit to himself that he is politicking. This candor with self, enables him to direct all his energy to the task at hand. The sooner Mr. WHO acknowledges his part in this game, the more rapidly negotiations can get down to the basics.

Mr. WHO also needs to find out the order of key subordinates in the company. Most bosses have one key subordinate, occassionally two, but rarely three. These men did not become key subordinates by getting high scores on psychological tests. These men know how to

heighten the boss' effectiveness and sense of well-being. These men can be trusted without limitation and will not usurp authority. These subordinates possess some personality characteristics which are not found in their bosses. They are able to handle people and Packard (1962) states that nearly three quarters of all office time is spent talking face to face with people. These subordinates are likely to be very people minded, enjoy working with people. They are better than average at sizing up people, at delegating work easily, not seeming to be unloading it from their own shoulders. They in turn have back-up men because their approach in reprimanding will be to do it quietly and informally with a pat on the back at the end. Mr. WHO must be careful of his personal reasons for negotiating with such subordinates, as they are likely to be quick to perceive the psychological needs of others and will satisfy, or play upon those needs, perhaps by personality manipulation--as their own needs dictate. These subordinates are also far too wise to permit feelings of resentment of authority to color their behavior. These men are able to immerse all of their thoughts in an analysis of whatever problem is at hand, to get to the heart of each matter and to conceptualize alternative solutions. They don't get lost in detail, and they are able to bring order out of near chaos, and to organize what psychologists call unstructured situations. They apply analysis, assessment, and integration to come up with an answer or a mode of behavior that is right. If Mr WHO comes up with a wrong response, his judgment is wrong, no matter how much thought went into it or how appropriate his course of action seemed at the time.

It is in relation to the personality characteristics of these businessmen that Rinker(1973) arrived at his theory of intimidation. This theory states that the results a person obtains are inversely proportionate to the degree to which he is intimidated. Rinker(1973) suggests that the first step in the HOW is to lay out a specific plan to keep from being intimidated. In order to lay out a plan you must know why you were intimidated in the first place. If you have an inferior posture, it is much easier to become a representative of the top level of management of the organization, not as the lowest level man willing to negotiate with this agency to secure needed services for the youth. It is essential that Mr. WHO establish in a strong posture as he may be dealing with executives who make a fetish of never showing emotion, or seeming to be ruffled. They maintain a serene, friendly, flexible facade and are carefully overintegrated. Or Mr. WHO may be dealing with the results of the impact of the typical large-corporate environment on its human managers. This man is so absorbed in company affairs that he becomes isolated from the viewpoints of others; and then when he finds himself confronted in the outer world with differences in viewpoints, he tends to react with hostility, suspiciousness, or bewilderment. In relation to this type of person, Ringer(1973) states that Mr. WHO should not be intimidated by know it alls who thriveon bestowing their knowledge on insecure people. He suggests that cotton in the ears and blinders next to the eyes, help while trudging along ahead with the confidence that whether or not someone else "knows it all" isn't really relevant; the only thing that is relevant is what you know and what you do. It

is important to keep in mind that what someone else knows or doesn't know will not affect your success one way or the other (unless he assists you in a positive manner).

Throughout all interactions with the agency and its personnel it is essential to keep one simple fact in mind. Batten(1963) states that the one common denominator in every successful negotiation is the ability to make the other person see the benefit to him, of your product, service or idea. It's really very simple isn't it?

Townsend(1970) and Packard(1962) both agree that generally speaking, the fewer meetings the better. Both as to the number of meetings and the number of participants. Packard relates that a New York management consultant firm, determined that after making a study of meetings held by the nation's hundred top industrial firms, that the average company had been holding about two thousand (2,000) company meetings a year. It was further demonstrated that 90% of the meetings were ineffective and that many, if not most should never have been called. The conclusion was that the common corporate practice of depending on the group approach was producing wide-spread deliberative paralysis. Decision-making and creativity, it was concluded are best approached on an individual basis. Armstrong (1974) also relates that everyone seems to recognize and agree that a committee, particularly a permanent one, usually can't accomplish anything of any significance. A committee is not a work-producing mechanism. One to one sessions with key subordinates and Mr. WHO will produce more rapid and more appropriate results for both organizations.

Mr. WHO needs to size up the situation. He needs to survey the facility and evaluate factors such as the resource mix needed to conduct operations, complexity of the tasks, the appeal that certain tasks have for worker-need satisfaction, employee attitudes, the social forces at work in the organization, the power structure of the organization and the expectations of high level management. Based on his ability to evaluate these key factors, he can then select his course of action. Kelly(1965) discusses the trade ways technique which focused on the positive results of the evaluation. Instead of trying to find out what was wrong with the company; they tried to find out what was right with the company. Then, they delineated these positive common denominators and built their course around the successful factors instead of the failure factors. Keep in mind it takes a very able person to distill out the good things and then to put those plus factors to work.

In conveying ideas, feelings, potential courses of action, many communication skills are required. Listening in short is a real art. Batten(1963) states that listening takes much intestinal stamina at times, but it can pay off handsonely. The toughminded person finds it much easier to draw out both the good and the bad from others than does his soft minded colleagues. Above all, the tough minded person sets an example by adhering in word and deed to this Law of Communication. Batten(1963) states this law: "When the communicatee does not understand exactly what the communicator intended, the responsibility remains that of the communicator.

batten(1963) relates that the key talent which is important here is empathy. Empathy is defined in the dictionary as the imaginative project of one's own consciousness into that of another person. Defined more simply, it is the knack of putting yourself in the other person's shoes. In business, this calls for phrasing orders and requests in ways that will be understood by people with widely varying backgrounds and abilities. Empathy, in brief is a highly desirable quality in any Mr. WHO.

Another form of communication involves the product of trees. In order to prevent an overwhelming mound of paperwork, everyone in the organization must be encouraged, through proper communications techniques, to view paper as having only one purpose; to get something done. If it is accomplishing nothing and will accomplish nothing, junk it. Batten(1963) refers to feedback from written communications and verbal communications. He relates that it is axiomatic that feedback must occur both as a result and as a prerequisite to an action. For instance, if you issue a lengthy and detailed order to a subordinate and he does not seek to have it clarified in any respect, it is often safe to assume that either he doesn't know enough to ask questions or you are unusually articulate. Since you can't always rely on your skill as a communicator, it is well to ask for feedback. This means,simply that the subordinate is requested to give back the essence of what you have told him so that you can verify his understanding of it, or modify and amplify your instructions to insure understanding.

In all forms of communication, it is often easy to overlook the simple and obvious fact that there is no substitute for the straightforward and understanding use of truth. Political maneuvering has rough going in a climate where management by objectives or results is operative; where candor and clear communication are practiced; and where a clear understanding of individual role and purpose exists. It is vital, says Batten(1963) that candor become the thing and that the reasons why be communicated from above.

When everything is analyzed, there are two characteristics that are almost always present in the successful manager or businessman. These are courage and logic. Courage can often be equated in a broad sense with honesty and integrity, and logic with the decision-making process. The real stuff of management according to Batten(1963) is less tangible and less measurable. It is courage, firmness, and candor. Empathy, insight and other evidences of a feeling for people are requirements, too, and it should go without saying that the latest and most sophisticated management tools (such as computers) are favored also. Keep in mind throughout all your communications, that honesty with yourself comes first. Before Mr. WHO embarks on any business venture, which he hopes will be lasting and enduring, he makes sure that it embodies the essentials of merchandising success. Not only must the product render a service, but he must honestly believe in his own heart that he is doing the businessmen a favor when you sell him that product or service. People, regardless of age, who temporize or compromise with their ideals are doomed to failure.

In relation to all comunications, the rule of thumb suggested by Batten(1963) is this: "If it can be misunderstood, it will be misunderstood." Therefore a premium is placed on simplicity. The toughminded Mr. WHO tolerates nothing less; fat, juicy words and phrases are labeled as the work of the immature. It is surprising how effective this emphasis can be if upper management really believes in it and practices it. From recent satire on the language of education, it appears that superintendents support is needed for such a change within the education systems of our nation. Batten also suggests that the skillful use of words often does more harm than good unless you believe in, feel and are what you say. A contrived or insincere interests in the other person rarely yields the best results. Such insincerity is usually sensed even when it is not consciously realized. What are the words which make the other person feel a quickening of the pulse? All relatively normal people want to live long and stay healthy. So try words like morbid, sordid, sickly, and watch the conscious and unconscious pulling away which results. On the other hand, watch the reaction of words which indicate zest, pep, health and sparkle. It goes without saying that the results you get, will be limited if you use even the best chosen words for their sake alone. The goal of Mr. WHO should be to make the people feel a sense of stretch and growth in direct response to the dynamically conceived words he uses.

Solution of the problems of communication in the business world is seldom easy, it requires courage, vision and empathy. What is missing, in short, is candor, which should not be confused with mere

bluntness, frankness, or coarseness, but should be viewed as applied honesty. Much of what is done in the name of diplomacy and pleasantness is simple prevarication and of an unwillingness to face up to a difficult situation. The Mr. WHO needs to practice candor and applied integrity in his face to face relationships. If he cannot do this he is unwilling to subject himself to the resulting emotional strains and he is definitely not a tough minded manager. He must be tough enough to endure the emotional rigors that may accompany the session, and he must realize that these will be outweighed by the benefits the other man will derive from the new insight and knowledge about his strengths and weaknesses. In relation to conflicts Packard(1962) relates that the really good bargainer thrives on tension arising from provocation or uncertainty. He may be as anxious as the next man, but what is another man's stress is his stimulation. Provocation creates anxiety in most of us, but we vary greatly in the way we react to it. The psychologically tough person may feel tense and anxious when he is taking risks or under pressure, but he is galvanized by his tensions. He speeds up. A psychologically soft person, on the other hand, is frozen by tension. He becomes immobilized. If hostile destructive tendencies become an important part of the man's response to stress,then the anxiety is of course and unhealthy one.

Through improved honest communications, Mr. WHO should be gaining some ideas of the procedures that are an inherent part of any organization. A procedure is defined as a series of related tasks that make up the chronological sequence and are the established way

of performing the work to be accomplished. Procedures are known as SOP's, standard practice instructions, and sometimes systems. Procedures are used in all companies whether or not they are formalized and recognized as much. Moreover, Mr. WHO will pay for the procedures, whether they are good ones or bad ones, and whether he follows them from the beginning or not. Many companies have feared that policy and procedures manuals might rigidify their operations, that the initiative of the lower echelons might be lessened along with imagination and innovation. This can happen, but only when the real purposes of the guidelines are not understood, when they are poorly prepared, and/or a climate of apathy exists. When a legal agreement is being written by two agencies, such as the school system and a private business, the procedures of both organizations must be included in the guidelines, so that attorney's for both organizations can agree on the validity of the document. Due to all the fine details involved in such an agreement, it is hoped that the Mr. WHO selected follows the Tortoise and Hare Theory of Ringer(1973). This theory says: "Don't tell me how fast you get out of the starting blocks; I'm only interested in where you are when the race is over." The explanation and its relevance to interagency agreements is that Mr. WHO needs to be a perfectionist by nature. He must get all the ground rules in order, have everything explictly defined, and get the complete lay of the land before he gets going. It is also anticipated that Mr. WHO had no intention of violating the theory of reality also proposed by Ringer(1973). The reality of a handshake and mere words are nothing in comparison to a clear written agreement, signed by both parties. There are no altruistic deeds when it comes

to business deals and attorneys. The Fiddle Theory proposed by Ringer (1973) also relates to any Mr. WHO working for a school system This theory states that the longer a person fiddles around with something, the greater the odds that the result will be negative. In terms of the deadline for fiscal agreements and contracts to be signed by members of the school boards, as well as by the boards of the agencies involved, a Mr. WHO without a knowledge of deadlines for submission of agreements, could have very negative results indeed. It is suggested that in order to minimize the fiddle theory, that the minutes of each meeting be sent to all participants, and that issues involved in the agreement are put in the form of a letter or an outline. Getting the ideas on paper and giving the associates something specific to work on saves a lot of time.

Concerning ideas, Mr. WHO has the right to be original and daring; but if he has to risk his job to accomplish an audicious stroke-- keep in mind that discretion is the better part of valor. It is also essential to remember that if Mr. WHO is in a position of responsibility and a serious mistake is made, he can never duck the responsibility. He has to face up to it and defend the agency, organization and the personnel involved.

Many times serious mistakes can be avoided by reading a person's body language. Posture should tell the world things that words do not convey, and that the mind is unwilling to admit. When someone is leaning against the wall of an elevator or a doorway, they should be reminded that far too often they do not stand on their own feet. If you see a person leaning forward when walking their normal

gait, their basic thrust in life is a bit too angry. A bounce in their steps tells observers that what they do, they do with a basic rhythm. Cox(1974) relates that when he slouches in chairs it reminds him that he is too dependent on others for approval. He states that animated, gesturing arms tell him that he is willing to communicate openly with those around him. But closed arms do not. If he finds his crossed hands are perspiring, he knows that he would rather be pounding the table. The man across the table doesn't need to know that, but it is important that the person sending the message understand it. Cox(1974) relates that a pointing finger says, "Listen here, that's the way its gonna be." But a waving finger says, "You're one devious operator mister." Not only must Mr. WHO participate in active listening, he must also be alert and engage in active watching as well.

Cox(1974) describes two types of reasons for accomplishing tasks. Manifest functions are those which are given rhetorical consensus and sanction. They are the generally believed purposes for which a building is build, a foundation is formed, a business is started or a couple has three children. Latent functions are the underlying and usually unconscious bases for the action being taken and for the things being the way they are. Manifest functions are the whys. Latent functions are the hows. Manifest functions are the up front; latent functions are down below. It is necessary to listen very carefully to differentiate the two functions when working sophisticated agency personnel. Manifest function of the new president reorganizing the company is to make it more efficient

while cutting costs. The latent function may be to establish his authority while portraying him as a man of action. The manifest function of establishing a management by objectives program is to motivate executives through increased participation. The latent function may be to enhance top managements reputation for being progressive. In addition to listening, asking the proper questions can assist in the rapid completion of agreements. For example, Cox (1974) suggest that Mr. WHO ask the question how instead of the question why. This would result in learning the method in addition to answering the why. For example, in asking the director or a workshop how he divides his clients up in the various work stations, the thoughtful Mr. WHO will also learn why he divides them that way. Why is content and intellectual thinking. How is process and action and doing. Cox(1974) relates that his business experiences teach him that he can find out the why by paying attention to the how.

An important part of communication relates to power. In the formal business organization, power has typically been attributed to the authority associated with position. However, in addition to position based influence, Carlisle(1973) purposes the concept of knowledge based influence as a potent source of control. He states that people tend to listen to and be influenced by the expert. If they consider a supervisor to be knowledgeable, they accept his direction-- not necessarily because he has formal authority, but because they feel it will result in the most desirable outcome. No one likes to engage in effort he feels is misdirected or wasted. Power also affects the positions of people when a supervisor and his

subordinate have a chat about a company matter. The senior man is assumed to have the floor. He is free to let his thoughts expand and ramble, if he wishes. The junior's defined rule is to confine his questions, statements and comments to the openings that are offered him. Senior has more freedom to vent his aggravations; junior can express only those feeling that are clearly sanctioned by the senior's immediate behavior. The junior's attitude toward the senior's ideas is appropriately one of deference. If he is critical, he is critical in a deferential way, not a detached way. If both Senior and Junior man are engaged in negotiations with Mr. WHO, problems are sure to occur in communications. It is suggested that guidlines and agreements be brought to final stages before seeking Senior mans approval. In this manner, he knows that he has the final say and yet has not had to be involved in all discussions leading to that point in the negotiations.

Many times during negotiations, the only thing Mr. WHO may lack is guts. He may have the product, personnel, capital and ability, but without guts, the agreement can fall right off the table with a bang, and years of frustrating effort, broken hearts and interrupted careers can result. It is necessary that Mr. WHO remember not to go through life scared to death. It isn't worthwhile. A coward dies a thousand deaths; a brave man dies but once. Along with this, cooperation versus friendship is another important issue. Cox(1974) states that cooperation can exist without friendship; but friendship cannot exist wothout cooperation. In the community, cooperation tends to be articulated; we agree to share

the water supply. In friendship, cooperation often escalates to non-verbal forms. Without saying a word or even thinking about it, a person may let you have some of his water. However, Cox(1974) relates that most of what passes for cooperation is really accommodation, and that in friendship, accommodation is alien.

The same point is made by Kelly using different words. Kelly(1965) reveals that man must make a choice; to succeed today, a person must be an educated conformist and in no case can he stick out his neck beyond the point of a quick retrieval. To take a stand for any reason, moral or otherwise, without leaving open the possibility of a quick reversal, is dangerous and foolhardy. It is not enough to do a good selling job to the man on the job, you must do continual and relentless selling job on the management. Kelly relates that it is important to remember that many people in positions of power are jealous of anybody with a creative selling spark. They themselves can't create; and they don't want anybody else to demonstrate the ability in public. Many good sales managers have talked themselves out of jobs by being good public speakers and demonstrating it at a board meeting. One final point made by Kelly (1965) which is food for thought is "When a financial or production man asks you a question, never tell him you do not know. Always come up with an answer, even if it is not accurate. If you don't, you're sunk." If Mr. WHO decides to take this advice, it is recommended that the answers be in verbal form only, never write down a "guesstimate."

Kelly(1965) also discusses the value of a symbol that has a history and a tradition behind it. Good selling leadership today uses symbols and awards in profuse quantities, but some of them mean little or nothing because they have nothing but froth behind them. A selling symbol or award is only as valuable as the leadership offering the award makes it. So beware of false gods offering false awards for temporary effort, promoting temporary policies or products. Also beware of unethical practices. Packard(1962) reports that a Harvard Business Review survey revealed that four out of five executives giving an opinion, affirm the presence in their industry of practices which are generally accepted and are also unethical. Modern Office Procedures reported a survey finding that most of the managers questioned felt that in the course of moving up through the ranks a man was likely to be expected at some point to take part in activities not usually considered honest or decent. So for Mr. WHO forewarned is forearmed.

In finalizing an agreement with the agency certain terminology must be understood to have the same meanings by both parties involved. Batten(1963) elaborates on the difference between training and development. Training can be interpreted to mean the orderly and systematic transmission of organized knowledge from one party or parties, to another party or parties. This is often accomplished by rote, and it can result in an orderly feedback or parroting of just what the recipient has been told. However, this is not development. Development occurs only when learning or modification of behavior takes place, and this is expressed in the application of

changed and expanded attitudes to achieve results. The principal difference is that training stresses the what of a thing and sometimes the how, but for real development, the why must be understood.

During negotiations, if you make promises be sure to keep them. Townsend(1970) states that if Mr. WHO is asked when he can deliver something, he should ask for time to think. He should build in a margin of safety. Name a date, and then deliver it earlier than he promised. The world is divided into two classes of people; the few people who make good on their promises (even if they don't promise as much) and the many who don't. Get in Column A and stay there. In that way you will be valuable wherever you are assigned. The word assigned is used, as the assumption is made that if you have read this far, you must be a Mr. WHO. As a Mr. WHO you are a member of a large bureaucracy or a small bureaucracy who is endeavoring to enter into negotiations with a business corporation.

If you are a member of a large bureaucracy remember Packard's (1962) characteristic features of life within a large bureaucracy: impersonality of treatment, an elaborate system of rules, and a proliferation of differentiations by hierarchial layers. Do something to change all this, as these things are very oppressive to the individual who cherishes his dignity and independence of mind. It also appears that the private bureaucracies have recently become more intrusive in their personal demands on the individual at the managerial level and more manipulative toward that individual. In any case, when typical organizational thinking is in full sway, the

individual reacts either by fighting the organization or by adapting himself to it, thereby becoming both passive and dependent. In relation to passivity, Batten(1963) says, "when you are inhibited, you hold yourself back; you fail to give freely of your energy, enthusiasn, and knowledge to worthwhile, productive enterprises. It is possible to be highly educated and thoroughly experienced and still not know how to be open and creative, to freewheel and bring new ideas to life. It is hoped that each of you are functioning within a productivity climate, which is calculated to provide the employee with stretch, push, identification, participation-- a total environment in which associates, subordinates, Mr. WHO's and superiors put forth more effort because <u>everyone's doing it</u>.

Batten(1963) reveals that somehow in the Limbo of modern business, it has become unfashionable to reveal a strong desire for greater personal fulfillment. Talking and writing about dollars, equipment, memos, and charts have often been an escape from the stark realization that business enterprises were established in response to human feelings.

That they exist to satisfy human feelings.

That they will be dynamic or static because of human feelings.

That they will succeed or fail because of human feelings.

Is there much difference between business enterprise and our educational system?

Bibliography

Armstrong, Frank A., Memos to Management, Stein and Day, New York, 1974, pp. 49,115,124,135.

Batten, J.D., Tough-Minded Management, American Management Association, New York, 1963, pp. 25,29,32,36,39,45, 51,63,67,73,80,81,85,103,109,112,116,119,130.

Bittel, Lester R., Management by Exception, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1964, pp. 54,87,93,113,118,153.

Carlisle, Howard M., Situational Management: A Contingency Approach to Leadership, Amacom, a division of American Management Associations, New York, 1973, pp. 7,15,19,25,28,32,64, 83,91,128.

Cox, Allan J., Work, Love and Friendship: Reflections on Executive Lifestyle, Simon and Schuster, New York, 1974, pp. 56, 88,95,114,142.

Kelly, Philip J., The Making of a Salesman, Schuman, New York, 1965, pp. 38,46,49,77,97,119,122,170,223.

Packard, Vance, The Pyramid Climbers, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962, pp. 22,23,112,117,126,130,150,155,159,160,164,169,173, 196,201,259,296.

Ringer, Robert J., Winning Through Intimidation, Fawcett Publications, Greenwich, Conn. 1973, pp. 31-38,47-56,121-125,138-183, 200-237.

Townsend, Tobert, Up the Organization, Alfred A. Knoph, New York, 1970, pp. 44,46,55,74,83,107.